4/26/79

sfAeye.



SAN FRANCISCO ART INSTITUTE

MOVIES -- MOVIES -- MOVIES

This Friday and Saturday nites starting at 6:30 is going to be a real Hollywood shoot-em by nite. Starting with Clint Eastwood and Richard Burton in "Where Eagles Dare" and, after a short intermission, (Food and drink available in the kitchen), Gregory Peck and Anthony Quinn star in "The Guns of Navarone". So if y'er looking fer a good nite of entertainment, that doesn't cost much, drop on by. It's only a buck for SFAI students, and a buck and a half for the rest of yall!

EDITORIAL LAST RITES

Well Folks, this being the last issue of the Eye for this year, I want to unveil the identy of the face in our logo. As you may have already guessed, it's the late great Captain Video! Before I go, I would like to thank the ones that helped in putting together these issues, and the members of the Student Senate for their support in keeping this togetha!

There will be a farewell party honoring Richard Miller on Wednesday, May 9, at 4:30 in 19B.

Dr. Miller has taught in the World Studies dept. of the Art Institute for 20 years and served as chair of that dept. in 1972-74. His contribution to the character and quality of the San Francisco Art Institute has been immense and unique.

We hope you will be able to attend the party. We are asking a cash donation from staff, faculty and students who have known and valued Richard over the years. The money will be used to provide refreshments for the party and the remainder will be a cash gift directly to Richard.

Please Give your contribution to Candy Hedberg, by Friday, May 4.

Whatever your contribution-donation, whether it's money or good will, or both, please come to the party.

HOUSING FOR SUMMER SESSION FACULTY

This summer we have a large summer session program planned. Many of the faculty will be from out of town and will need a house or apartment to rent or housesit. Some are alone; some are coming with families.

We would appreciate your help in finding adequate housing for these faculty members. If you hear of any situation that might serve someone, could you please call me. The art Institute will not be paying for this housing; the arrangements will need to be made with the faculty member.

Our summer session dates are listed below- There is at least one person for each session, in need of housing.

Session One - May 29-June 22
Session Two - June 25-July 20
Session Three - July 23-August 17

Thank you for your help in this matter,

Candy Hedberg.

Major Budget Issues

Revenues:

Tuition and Fees:

Cost of Living and Merit Pay Increases for Staff:

$55,000 is included for these increases. No increase is recommended for faculty due to the 42% raise implemented in 1978-79.

Retirement for Faculty and Staff:

No expenditures are included in the budget for retirement. If a surplus of income is generated from the Fall semester, implementation of a modest retirement plan is recommended effective January 1, 1980.

Scholarships:

$231,800 is included for scholarships, a 14% per capita increase above the original 1978-79 budget. This amount is calculated as follows:

Original 1978-79 budget	$214,300
Adjustment for 5% enrollment decline	-10,700
Revised scholarship base for 1979-80	$203,600
14% increase to offset tuition incr.	+28,200
Recommended budget for 1970-80	$231,800

Additional Contact Hours for Humanities and Art History:

Enrollments are expected to decline by about 5% in 1979-80. However, applications for the Fall 1979 semester are about 13% ahead of last year as of mid-March; so total tuition income could exceed the budgeted projections.

Recommended tuition schedule:
+8% for continuing undergraduates (increase from $1,430 to $1,550 per semester)
+22% for new undergraduates (increase from $1,430 to $1,750 per semester)
+8% for continuing graduates (increase from $1,190 to $1,290 per semester)
+34% for new graduates (increase from $1,190 to $1,600 per semester)

Trust Funds:

Receipt of the Ford grant and completion of the matching campaign are assumed. The income figures reflect projected continuation of current investment policies and rates of return. Higher yields could be attained by reinvestment in bonds or certificates of deposit, even assuming lower interest rates in 1979-80. Additional revenues of $20,000 to $30,000 are possible through reinvestment.

Auxiliary:

The 8% surcharge on store prices - implemented in November, 1978 to temporarily increase scholarship funds - is discontinued effective July 1, 1979.

Expenditures:

Debt Reduction:

$75,000 is set aside to reduce operating debt. Re-financing of this debt on a longer term basis, possibly through the Regents of the University of California, is recommended.

An increase of $27,000 in faculty salaries is included to achieve uniformity in the contact hours in non-studio classes.

2 ALTERNATWES

The failure of nuclear power to provide a safe and clean substitute for fossil fuels has enhanced the need for presently underdeveloped alternatives. The attitude of the Federal government remains the development of coal and nuclear resources to shore-up the shrinking supplies of petroleum and natural gas. Renewable energy development and research is receiving a lot of self-serving commentary but little budget support. This stop-gap approach is shortsighted and promises a future of chemical and radioactive pollution.

Other resources can provide what fossil and nuclear fuels will never; a clean,safe and virtually limitless energy future. Fusion, geothermal, and solar power are only a few examples of the alternatives that can furnish the planet with energy that is compatable with its survival.

Fusion power utilizes the principle at work in the sun; the fusing of light atoms into heavier ones with an accompanying release of energy. The process is different from nuclear fission which splits atoms to produce energy. Far less radioactivity is produced in the fusion process and most of it is short lived. However, no technique has yet been developed that enables containment of the tremendous heat which iniates and is sustained by the fusion reaction. A conventional containment vessel would be vaporized into plasma. Physicists are exploring non-material containment methods with magnetic fields and laser implosion.

Amazing progress has been made. Many fusion scientists promise that reactors could be on line by 2000 if a national effort was concerted. When fusion is achieved it could be fueled almost limitlessly with hydrogen isotopes readily available from seawater.

There are several drawbacks which renders fusion a less than ideal energy hope. A fusion plant would require elaborate cooling techniques resulting in a certain degree of thermal pollution. Tremendous technical problems still need to be resolved. The persistent problem of radioactive waste disposal would necessitate the safe disposal of saturated reactor walls every 20-30 years. Although the radioactive materials produced in fusion amount to about 1/2 of 1% of that produced in fission reactions, there is presently no reliable means to store any amount of nuclear waste.

For these reasons fusion may fall short of being the ultimate solution to world power shortages. Other energy sources are readily available and pose fewer long-term complications.

Geothermal energy originates in the earth's molten center where radioactive decay and tidal friction generate heat in excess of 1000 degrees C. As a result of heat migration toward the surface, temperatures increase at the rate of 30 degrees C for each kilometer of depth. By sinking heat wells this temperature differnce can be harnessed to produce power at the surface. Geothermal plants already exist in the Geyser fields of Northern California and are proving their feasibility. However it is feared that wide-spread drilling and sudden extraction of heat from the earth's interior may aggravate unstable geological formations resulting in earthquakes. A substantial energy investment will also be required in drilling as deep as 35000 feet to recover heat of an optimum temperature. This would initially require the committment of already scarce conventional energy supplies.

While geothermal power appears preferrable to fusion as a long-range source, neither can be depended upon to supply a total solution. As with fusion, government support of geothermal research and development has been apathetic.

Enough sunlight (useable sunlight at proven conversion efficiencies) Falls on the continental United States to supply 160 times the present demand for power. Solar technology has made tremendous advances in the last ten years in spite of funding on paltry budgets. The sun is the source of all energy reserves on earth and can directly supply the ultimate in clean, safe and inexhaustable power. Solar heating and electricity would quickly reach competitive feasibility if more than the present$200 million in Federal funding was alloted. Solar power becomes infinitely feasible when faced with the eventual exhaustion of world energy supplies.

The development of renewable energy resources implies a massive realignment of economic relationships since it would encourage and probably require the equal distribution of much energy producing capital. Power intersts would have to stretch their tongues far to justify long-term profiteering on a commodity which falls freely from the sky. The proposed windfall profit tax would best be directed toward the research and development of new energy technologies. This would go far toward encouraging a pattern of energy consumption that the planet can live with.







STUDENT SENATE - Spring 1979

Officers:

Stanley Greene	Chair
Andrea Brown	Vice-Chair
Jim Bressi	Secretary
Peter Man	Treasurer

Senators:

Wayne Levin
John Copa
Lane Starling
Liz Cash
Gordon Perlow
Jim Weiss
John Whitehead
John Cavanaugh
Michael Wilcox

EDITOR.....GORDON PERLOW
ASSISTANT EDITOR.....MITCH FOLSOM
SPECIAL ASSISTANCE...TERRY DOVALE
ELLEN GEORGE
PHOTOGRAPHY.....GORDON PERLOW

THIS PAPER IS SPONSORED BY
THE STUDENT SENATE OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO ART INSTITUTE

SFA EYE COPYRIGHT APRIL 25,1979



A GENERAL INTRODUCTION for SFAIEYE

A major portion of this issue of the SFAEYE was produced by members of a photography criticism course. The intention of their efforts is to share some of their discussions regarding the quality of an art education, the function of cultural activity, and the value of an artist as a person in this society. Their efforts also stand as an announcment for the necessity of an open and genuine communication; for a more knowing and truly transformative action.

To further facilitate this initial awareness and dialogue, a forum to discuss and review these and other concerns will be held on Friday April 27, 1979 at 7:30 p.m. in Brooks Kitchen. It is also hoped that another issue of the EYE will follow, which will contain response and feedback to the concerns raised here.

A Collective Introduction

Because many of us question the practice of art and the experience of our Art Education, these personal comments may be seen as critique of the official view of the S.F.A.I. and the way that view-point advances its own interests, often at the expense of the students. This is not simply a critical exercise. Striving to gain control over the significance we give our art and its effect on our lives, outside this particular institution, we see this critical examination as a necessary step in illuminating the underlying myths and assumptions that shroud meaning in formalism and credibility in 'genius'. Instead, believing in the power of art to alter our perceptions and actually change our lives, we realize an urgent need to examine how we as artists can facilitate this ideal. By questioning together, sharing our anger, doubts, and aspirations, we have gained support while searching for greater moral and social relevance in our life and our art. We recognize a need to return to a basic understanding of the interconnecttedness of our personal and private concerns with larger economic, social and political considerations. These collected articles serve as a means to engage others in this continuing dialogue. Many of the concepts introduced in what follows where initiated in the Review of Contemporary Photography class this fall and spring. However, while these ideas may be completely useless to support the practiced ideals of the S.F.A.I., they serve a larger need, and that is that they are, to quote Walter Benjamin, "useful for the formulation of revolutionary demands in the politics of art." Those who are dissatisfied with the co-optation of artistic significance into' merely aesthetic concerns, and seek, as we do, to extend the meaning and practice of art itself are invited to share in our radical redefinition of what art is.

---Connie Hatch

Most publications (and other media) have a philosphical foundation in educating consumers. We are either directed to buy merchandise or accept the domination of specific ideologies. Most critical art media do both. We are then only spectators. We can come up with something new and it can be accepted by the various media (galleries, museums, newspapers, magazines, TV, etc.) but as competitors we are divided. We are alienated from the basic human disire to share our observations. When we assert our individuality only with the intent of breaking into the spotlight and being the representative of a factional event we are susceptible to having our work co-opted by the status-quo which depends only on hierarchy. Individual effort becomes an isolated event which is appropriated by established authorities who present it for only spectator support as an isolated event abstracted from the individual. Individual effort does not have to be directed to this kind of "success". If we participate in events that we initiate based on our own personal situations then the only authority is self authority. Problems are not so abstract for participants as they are for spectators. As we spectate on conflicting events we retain these conflicts. The only way to resolve them is to participate with self authority. Without encouraging or accepting the participation of others we are only producing another authoritarian influence to add to the conflict. There is a need them for a forum for sharing the resolution of conflicting influences. This publication can be that forum. The next issue of this publication will be devoted to dialogical participation by it's audience with no hierarchical distinctions made. We can create our own situations and in so doing have our own authority over them and leave behind the conflicts imposed on us by those who would have us follow their events as spectators.

---Ken Mann

IS THERE LIFE AFTER ART SCHOOL?

The anomaly presented to the art student between that period which he/she spends within the boundaries of the institution of their choice and the reality which is necessarily to be faced upon departure is indeed a tremendous one. The analogy of the ostrich that hides its head in the sand in order to ignore danger is equally applicable to the art student that refuses to acknowledge the existence that awaits them.

The purpose of this is not to list the numerous inequities that will be encountered nor to bemoan their ubiquity but instead to begin to approach a praxis upon which, individually, the art student can effectively partake in the structure of which they have become a part.

The formation of such a praxis requires both an awareness of the situations with which the art student will be confronted and a critical philosphy with which to deal with them. To these ends classroom dialogue can be addressed.

It needs to be stressed that this praxis be carefully structured to the current and future needs of people, and not become sidetracked by nihilistic verbalism nor mindless activism. Further, it is a 'plurality of needs' which are to be met, a plurality devoted towards the same ends, not a single idealistic goal conceived outside social relations.

The ideological foundation upon which this praxis is based is necessarily incorporated not only within the work so produced but also its dissemination; and it is towards the formation and establishment of this ideological foundation that this article is addressed.

It is at this time possible to see that choices are available for the art student who wishes to partake in establishing change within the community, for not only has current art practice led to a situation that is in critical need of alteration but it is also perceivable that it is people that control circumstances and not vice-versa.

--Philip Lipman

We live in a society which views limits on technological progress in any form as heresy. Our world is full of experts and specialists who are certified by institutions full of more experts to make our progress for us. We must forge ahead at any cost or fail. Change that would require same limits on growth is often labeled insane. These institutions (schools, governments, huge corporations, museums) interpret objective data and distribute the results to the rest.

CONTINUED P. 9

We must fit in with these results or be ground up as fuel for more institutions. In schools and museums for example, distinctions are made between teachers and students and artists and people. These distinctions foster exploitation by experts (already certified) over non-experts and maintain the status-quo. Human values must always be repressed for class differences and greed to remain part of human life.
As a collective we have met to create dialogue concerning the broader context of which art and photography are a part. In an effort to transform our discussions into meaningful action we have initiated this publication. We hope to open our discussions to genuinely interested persons and foster widespread dialogue in support of returning moral and ethical values to photography. We also offer possible alternatives to continued "extension of tradition", as we feel nothing short of a radical redefinition of art can aid in the human cultural revolution that has already begun.

---Bruce Freeman

"A friend of mine went to a Mexican market with a game called 'Wff 'n Proof', which consists of some dice on which twelve logical symbols are imprinted. He showed children which two or three combinations constituted a well formed sentence, and inductively within the first hour some onlookers also grasped the principle. Within a few hours of playfully conducting formal logical proofs, some children are capable of introducing others to the fundamental p proofs of propositional logic. The others just walk away."

"To deschool menas to abolish the power of one person to oblige another person to attend a meeting. It also means recognizing the right of any person, of any age or sex, to call a meeting."

---Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society

A class is not a game but games are played in it (game-process of interaction). A class is a mini-institution and we could not escape that fact because we were meeting under the auspices of a parger institution as a unit in a curriculum. People disinterested in (or unable to cope with) the way the class was going could not "just walk away" because they presumably had a substantial economic investment in the class and might lose the credit.

The original title of the class, Photographic Criticism, was only marginally relevant to it, as it turned out. In fact it wasn't a class at all, but a town meeting (in miniature for observational purposes) disguised as a class. Our task at this point is to take off the mask and open the inquiry up to other interested people. It isn't as if we have anything specific to talk about as a class (or group, let's call it). We're all over the place in terms of direction, philosophy, etc. The point is to open up the discussions so that motivated people can discover what they aspire to in common with one another, and to act towards the realization of those aspirations. This isn't a sloganized "new movement" but simply an exercising of the principle elucidated in the above quotes by Illich.

---Elliot Shannonhouse

Great work is born from the thirst for enlightenment. The quest for knowledge gives rise to the wisdom of tomorrows art.
DARE TO STRUGGLE! dare to break free of constricting fules and misconceptions!
DARE TO BE AN INDIVIDUAL!
don't follow the rules! Make your own rules! Don't join the parasites of ideology...make your own ideology...Don't be critical of other's art...MAKE YOUR OWN ART!
For the serious individual...personal consciousness and self-unity is imperative if not definitive of creative art itself.

---John Block



JOB SEARCH WORKSHOPS

Repeated by popular demand!

JOB HUNTING WORKSHOPS

Presented by Student Life Office

Wednesdays 12 noon - 2 p.m. **Lecture Hall**

April 25: Identify Skills You Could Get $ for, Pinpoint Your Goals.

May 2: Resume Writing and Other Job Searching Paperwork

May 9: Discovering Those Hidden Jobs and Interviewing Techniques

Attendance at all three workshops is recommended as they are designed as a series, but you are welcome at any one of them. All attendees will receive The Job Hunter's Workbook: A Self-Help Guide for Artists Looking for Work, a recent publication of the Student Life Office.

IN HONOR OF



The LATE Capt VIDEO

Is photography nothing more than a form of consuming? Is the viewer primarily passive rather than engaged in a process of change and development? These are not easy questions to answer. The person viewing the photograph is in some sense passive, but is he only a consumer unless he takes some kind of action on the basis of having seen such a photograph? It is not al all clear what sort of action one could ever take on the basis of merely looking at photographs. However, we can surely learn things of value even within situations in which we cannot take any immediate action.
Victor Burgin believes the main thrust of contemporary photography has been concerned with justifying itself as an art form. I agree with his attitude that such attempts are a waste of time. It is more important to realize that photography is a communicative process that supports and perpetuates an ideology.

---Alan Parks

An Alumnus' Perspective

Graduation was near and I realized I was faced a new set of problems. Form and content, and line and tone were suddenly meaningless. Those problems seemed so important while I was in school but now, what's after graduation?

How was I going to support myself and what was to become of my photography. There wasn't any job waiting for me after graduation. The skills acquired while in school lost their importance. What mattered now was getting work so I could continue to photograph. The very society that put that institution there had no place for me. Learning the language of what a picture looks like or how it alludes to some metaphor was not going to get me work.

The art school that I supported while learning seemed without an authentic human purpose. On the one hand it nurtured young talent by providing instruction and facilities but no training was available about how to support oneself and still maintain a human relationship with ones work after graduation.

I realized that this school was producing artists that society could not assimilate. I felt decieved by that secure environment of school. So what alternatives were available to me? Could I somehow connect my creative and material exigencies.

Commercial work was rejected because I understood it to be shallow and limiting. Shallow because of it's inherent need to be clear and simplistic, and limiting because even though creative effort is made it is ultimately for someone else to sell something. Any compromise I could make would only support my own alienation. I need to recognize myself in the work I do. I could not allow myself to be manipulated by a society that I support.

The "education" I received from art school failed to provide a concrete content that would allow me to live and work as an artist. So what purpose does an art school serve? It certainly does not serve society by producing artists that cannot be integrated into it and it certainly does not serve the artist by alienating him from the world he is so dependent upon. The problem is an economic and social one. which the art school is a part. In order to facilitate change we must become acutely aware of our own socio-economic situation. My conclusion was that my ideal work situation did not exist, but committed myself to advancing my own awareness.

MY purpose here is to recognize my situation and seek sympathetic people who may have experienced the same. In that way the established dialogue could possible affect some change. I encourage anyone to respond.

---Paul Rossman

The following survey was compiled by:
Nancy Menzies and Kathy Keer.

1. How long have you been at S.F.A.I.?

1 year
2 years
3rd semester
since September 1977
4 semesters
2 years

2. Have you ever attended other schools for art?

No
Yes, a University and a state college
Yes, a four year program, BFA degree in Canada, I was there for my first two years.
Not in this country. I attended the National School of Fine Arts in Uruguay (now closed)
A medical hospital (medical art) and a community college (fine arts)

3. Why are you attending art school?

For a more rounded experience, to complement a lopsided sciences education, to see how I function in a "wide-open" educational atmosphere. Art is fun. To learn from my teachers, peer group and anyone who may come here---and they do come here as visiting artists and as working artists. I view this school as being one of the focal points for the arts in this area (the bay area and Northern California) I am also here to get a higher degree and to learn how to teach. To compress what migh take me ten to twenty years to learn by myself into four years. To get feed-back and simulation from other students and the teachers. To get a degree in a field I enjoy.

My education as a photographer was completely seperated from other art fields. Some of us felt, though, the necessity of relating to then, and demanded from our school (in Uruguay) that artists be invited to exchange ideas. I think an art school, if properly oriented, is the best place to understand our lifestyles and realize man's ability to do and undo things around him. If not properly oriented, art schools may become inaccesible islands in the middle of a society.

To finish my bachelors.

Good question...get away from New Jersey, to learn from other artists..

4. Do you think school has a positive or negative effect on your work?

Thus far, a negative effect on my self-confidence and sureness of my photographic direction. Intimidation and inhibition (a little). A positive effect on broadening mu narrow attitudes about art and people.

It has a positive effect because I am determined to find the positive aspects and utilize them.

Most definately a positive effect. Perhaps I'm not getting encouraging comments -"hey that's good," "oh, I love it!", but I am being presented with deadlines which force me to continue when I otherwise might quit.

~~A~~ CONVERSATION: Jim Pomeroy and Reagan Louie

Those who authentically commit themselves to the people must re-examine themselves constantly. This conversion is so radical as not to allow of ambiguous behavior. To affirm this commitment but to consider oneself the proprietor of revolutionary wisdom-which must then be given to (or imposed on) the people-is to retain the old ways. The man who proclaims devotion to the cause of liberation yet is unable to enter into communion with the people, whom he continues to regard as totally ignorant, is grievously self-deceived. The convert who approaches the people but feels alarm at each step they take, each doubt they express, and each suggestion they offer, and attempts to impose his 'status', remains nostalgic towards his origins.

Paulo Freire

...the art faculty is operating in an unreal world, dealing with unreal students rampant with illusions of an unreal future.

Walter Gabrielson

At one point in the conversation, Jim Pomeroy, the chairman of SFAI's sculpture department, claims that 'one faculty member doesn't have a sense of what another faculty member is doing'. The reasons for such a condition are complex, yet clearly some of the factors include fear, ignorance, and convention. In an attempt to overcome this 'wall of silence', I approached Jim to initiate a sorely needed dialogue about the Art Institute and it's larger art and social contexts. For the most part I am sympathetic to much of what Jim had to say about the nature of art education and art practice. I wish to express my appreciation and respect for his generosity, courage, and vision during this conversation. I believe that it is from this kind of awareness; an awareness that is generated from a communal and human foundation, that a truly transformative practice will emerge. I began the conversation in the spirit of this ideal.

Reagan Louie

RL: How long have you been at the SFAI?

JP: I've been teaching here since January 1977, when I taught a printmaking seminar. I was invited by the printmaking department to teach it. The first option they wanted was someone who wasn't an artist, then they settled on someone who wasn't a printmaker. I think it was real productive, both in terms of myself and in terms of the students, and the work. It was a way of disconnecting from the kind of focus on the school, on being a graduate student, and on printmaking; it was a way of dealing with some other things. The guests were Robin Lakoff, Kathrina Krimski, a Phil Glass concert, a rehearsal of 'Hospital' with the cast (before we even started talking about work). Before that I served on the board as an artist trustee. I've been on the artist committee since 1972. In fact I think I was still in graduate school when I became a member of the artist committee. That is my earliest direct involvement with the Institute.

RL: If you began teaching at the Institute as a guest instructor in printmaking, how did you begin teaching in the sculpture area?

JP: In a very funny way. I was hired without interview; without advertising, directly by the Dean. It was something I felt very anxious about. But I discussed it with some members of the faculty and student body, and other people who had a close association with the Institute in other capacities. On the basis of their recommendations, I decided to give it a try. It wasn't a decision as far as I know that was reached by the sculpture department. And as far as I know the sculpture department wasn't interested in dealing with that decision, which is fairly typical of recent selections of chair.

RL: You mentioned that before you made your decision you had to discuss it with some other people. What were your expectations and feelings about the Institute at that time? And how have they been either confirmed or changed by your subsequent experiences?

I did not realize that you had entered into the Institute under such tricky circumstances.

JP: It was a totally tricky situation and sort of scary. It was awkward. The Institute has real and strong and fairly compicated in-group structures, strong hierarchies, and strong allegiances and pecking orders.

RL: Who are you speaking of; the faculty, administration, students?

JP: I'm speaking pretty much of the whole thing. How a person relates, whoever they are, whether they are faculty, student, or unaffiliated visitor, the entrance into this dynamic, is very important. How one enters. How that entrance is perceived. How that introduction is made. Its true of any social situation, but it seems to be a particularly touchy thing here.

RL: Its quite true. In my case, my appointment or even the possibility of my appointment was determined largely by the person who was the chairman at that time; by the climate that was established during that tenure. I don't think that I would be here if that climate had not existed. This climate represented a shift in the photography department's orientation, from an intuitional approach to what was perceived as an intellectual approach. The apparent stark contrast of this shift compounded the usual conflicts that result from any change. I still do not know all the details around this change but feel that much of it is unresolved. I feel that having come in at this moment has in many ways colored my existence and activity at the Institute. I would like to explore this by first considering the legacy of the Institute. Often I hear a rather vague history of the Institute, especially of it's foundation, given as a justification for how it is run or how it should be maintained. I say that the history reference is vague even idealized because it usually fails to address such basic questions as: What was the relation of art to San Francisco society in 1871? Who were the founding artists? What were their motivations?

JP: I think in terms of an art school its a fairly unique beginning. I think that the thing people don't acknowledge is that an artist in 1870 is very different from an artist in 1970- the reasons for art, the reasons for being an artist, who essentially is an artist, or who is allowed the indulgence of being an artist, or who is forced to choose that as a life style- all those options, all those roles are very different then and now. For the most part art schools are formed as business ventures or as philanthropic gestures on the part of someone who already has too much money and who wants to make a gesture of some form of cultural charity in a very public way. And that was very much what happened with the Art Institute which is obscured. I mean that its always talked about as an artists' school and somehow Mark Hopkins is left out of it. For a good part of it's history this was not the SFAI or even the CSFA, this was the Mark Hopkins School of Art. I have the feeling that being an artist in San Francisco in the late 1870's was a fairly comfortable socially-acceptable practice, performed by people who were in a position to take that on in the first place. I think that art was not a necessity in terms of the way people feel about it now (in a more romantic vision). And I also think that to be an artist it was something that was practiced by people who were fairly financially independent. I don't think there were any rag to riches stories. There wasn't the same sort of market structure. And works weren't produced in quite the same way. There weren't the same kinds of rhythms where an artist sequesters himself in a studio for two years and produces alot of items and puts them out in a show to see which gets red dots next to them.

RL: What I'm suggesting is that whenever an idea comes up that questions the nature of this place, this notion of how the Institute was founded, 'by artists for artists', is raised. Its

RL: a very 19th century idea of art and artists.

JP: Its like using the words which are from the 19th century- but I think the concept of artist is much more of a 1950 romantic version of artist.

RL: But there is a continuum in those versions.

JP: But when people talk about the Art Institute; that it was founded by artists for artists, I think that they somehow transpose a very romanticized version of Clyfford Still back on the 1870's.

RL: I would say that's consistent or at least that the story attempts to make it consistent to how it was founded. In other words its founded upon very 19th century viewpoints and perhaps very mannered ones at that. The crucial point is that now it is simply an archaic viewpoint in terms of what an artist's relationship to the society should be in the 1980's. I wonder if this hierarchy or pecking order starts from this type of obsolete logic.

JP: What I mean by pecking order has to do more with the notion of the hierarchies. Its a little society; it has stated goals and it has real goals or real objectives, real functions. I think that everyone says that an art school is supposed to be a place where artists are created- or where one goes to learn to become an artist. That may happen, but it happens to not as a great extent as one would suppose. The basis for that is the simple statistic that five years after graduating less than one out of ten art school graduates are still artists; or ever functioned as a practicing artists. If you ran a business or provided a service with a ten per cent success rate you would not be considered very successful. I think that the Art Institute is a successful venture in its goals, but I think these goals are not the production of artists. I think that these goals are the maintainence of hierarchies and the protection of institutions- self-protection. Who benefits in an art school? Who is

JP: it for? I think largely the greatest beneficiaries of an art school are its faculty. Naturally, the longer a person is a beneficiary of an institution the greater the benefit. That also functions as a burden upon the institution to promote that. That's definitely implicit in the idea of the academy, even more so in the more precise term of conservatory. Think about the ways in which ideas are relayed, studied, reinforced, reflected, the kind of inertia that is inherent in those places. I think then the same characteristic functions here. That's what the pecking order and hierarchies is about- how you relate and support those things; what benefits are available to you in long range terms; alot of what a student learns here and how that student benefits is directly related to those quantities. In other words, what a student learns is those roles. I think that what people learn at art schools is how to be art teachers rather than artists, because you don't see as much art practiced as art teaching practiced.

RL: I agree with you. This happens to all institutions where illusory goals come into conflict with the real achievements. How does the perpetuation of the institutional illusion, what you have called the consensus fantasy, get played out by the faculty?

JP: If you look at the faculty, you'll find that an inordinately high percentage of the faculty are alumni. In other words what they learned when they went to the Art Institute was the Art Institute. And they're here to teach the Art Institute to new members of the Art Institute. Also (this is usually a criticism of all schools), there is a declining rate of production frequently on the part of the members of the faculty. And in some cases within every school there are members of the faculty that have never really functioned as artists at all, they have an invisible track record, a very token performance. The problem with hiring ex-students as faculty as opposed to hiring artists as faculty is that the only time the judgement about the individual's work is made its made in the classroom, not in an arena of public

JP: discourse. It also says 'we're interested in a mode of behavior, in alignment with the consensus fantasy, and the perpetuation of that'. It increases insularity, it increases distance from professionalism, it increases distance from real communication, it increases distance from responsibility of an artist to anything, to deal with anything other than again the perpetuation of that fantasy.

RL: What are your personal experiences with all this? How did you cope with your tricky entrance?

JP: Most of the response did not come from the sculpture department. Most of the response was from largely the painting department and it was a very negative response. We were applying for a Title VI grant. I called a meeting, in the Fall of 1977 of the sculpture department to discuss needs, equipment suggestions, modifications of the plant, curriculum, etc., to find out if there were any problems, to feel out whether some things were being dealt with well; weren't being dealt with; just open sort of issues. It fell into a quagmire, it didn't get much in the way of suggestions on the part of anything. It wasn't that people seemed happy with it, it just seemed that people were unwilling to put much energy into dealing with the questions seriously. It also left a couple members of the department unhappy that curriculum was being discussed at all because they felt that it would impose unwanted liens on the particular programs that they had been developing. There was also a suggestion that the idea of dealing with sculpture was a problem, in that alot of work that had sculptural concerns was shared with concerns taking place in other departments. That a more effective way of talking about sculptural curriculum would be to discuss the possibility of a shared curriculum with the painting department. I didn't like the idea. But it was an idea that had alot of merit. It was suggested by the former chairman, and made alot of sense on some levels. So a meeting was called with the two departments. The painting

JP: department's response was so overwhelmingly hostile, it was incredible. The real funny thing about that was that it obviously tapped an incredible insecurity. Clearly they have double the amount of faculty, so that if even half the painting department voted against the issue there would be no problem. When you negotiate from a position of strength you can be very passive, be very congenial, and very relaxed, but there was fist pounding and people getting red in the face and screaming, and a whole lot of personal attacks on me, the whole thing became a circus. No real productive discussion was made on the real qualities of the issue. Alot of the time things like tradition were raised on the part of the painting faculty.

And the name 'nigger' was raised by some of the sculpture faculty in terms of what they felt their relationship to the rest of the school was. They had so often been ignored or abused, their programs, their ideas had been ignored so long by a power bloc, that it was an opportunity at least to get it off their chest. If a group holds all the cards anyway, why should they get so freaked out? That was one of the first tip-offs to me that the issue was about a larger form of insecurity. People were really threatened. The reason I thought the merger was a bad idea to begin with was because of the way the painting department feels about the sculpture department. The nicest thing about the division is that the painting department cannot get to the sculpture department's jobs. But I can see if all of a sudden those people where members of the same department if anything came to a crunch those would be the first jobs to go, and there would be no representation, no impact on that. Yet it was the painting department who was terrified of the thing. It would have been not really very productive to deal with the inter-disciplinary qualities of the work. That clearly wasn't the issue of the discussion. It was a whole other mess, a whole other box had been opened that let out a great deal of hostility. It polarized alot of people. It polarized me. I refer to it as a case of rape where the terrified victem,

P: the elephant, ran in terror from the mouse.

L: How do you account for the insecurities? Obviously it has something to do with the specific individuals, but are there other problems?

P: It was perceived as an attack on the fantasy- coming to grips with real issues; problems of change. The most vocal people, with the exception of one individual, are people that have no career left, they barely have a painting habit. They're also the most adamnant, the most uptight people in terms of preserving what these traditions seem to be. It falls into almost a union issue of protectionism without giving any thought to the real commitments those individuals have to any of the real goals; and about the maintenance of the conservatory; and the maintenance of a social structure. The thing about that is that the social structure no longer exists, the climate for that art work, which they are no longer producing, also no longer exists. And apparently the only way they can see themselves with any self-worth is to fabricate Disneyland on Chestnut Street. Its not 1950 anymore. The sad thing about it is that it would be okay even though its not 1950, if people were producing in full faith with a real audience. Its real easy to produce 1950's art when you've practiced it for thirty years. What are they teaching? When is the last time they had an aesthetic experience? When is the last time they did something that provoked an aesthetic experience in someone else? And that is just addressing the stated goals of the Institute- the ostensible objectives of the school. That doesn't say anything about the quality of those objectives.

RL: I was assuming that, because I would have to question whether simple production is finally a suitable criteria for validation. And I would say definitely not. What do you see as the

RL: role of an art school in the 1980's? Our particular situation at the Art Institute complicates this question, in that it's concerns don't even match present realities, and instead fall somewhere between 1871 and 1950. I'm feeling fairly skeptical and not too optimistic.

JP: I'm real skeptical about the issues of contemporary art anyway. I'm not optimistic about the value of an institution like Cal Arts, that says its the school of the avant-garde. If you're going to do that you wouldn't go to an art school, you would go to a business school because that is what it is. It has all the dynamics of a business. You'd ignore the ideas of tradition, because tradition isn't very important in contemporary art. Tradition isn't very important at the bank, or the IRS, its not very important when you have to pay your rent, or when someone wants to sell alot of magazines like Artforum. Its also not very important in terms of being a real artist,in terms of what art can really do. Traditionally its been a way of relating to a set pattern, without really dealing with the qualities of that pattern, and what that pattern reflects. I think art schools are dinosaurs. If an art school is to survive it will have to mutate into something other than an art school.

RL. What do you see that as being?

JP: I see it as a couple of things. I see it becoming a business school, dealing with qualities of contemporary art, which have to do with the permutation of information in a market place.

RL: In other words working on the various support systems, learning how to survive as an artist.

JP: Yeah. It usually means learning the behaviour patterns of a long range reconnaissance scout. Because that is what the vanguard of the avant-garde means, which is a military term. Its like staying ahead of the pack, sniffing out the safe passes, getting a good perspective of whats coming up, knowing where you can cross the river, where you're going to run into a mess of trouble, and where you have to seek

P: an advantage. I mean its all military in terms.

L: I sense a parody here...

P: Yeah. But essentially thats what you learn in an art school. You learn how to dress, how to talk, who to talk to, who not to talk to, whats worth reading, whats not worth reading, and occasionally what it takes necessarily to produce, as a prop, to get you into a position to do all those things. Its all done with...

L: Mirrors apparently.

P: Its all done with this funny double talk that relates to the quality of the prop thats being produced. But the props have even a shorter half life than the life of the artist. Theres already enough props around. Its like how many more bad paintings do you need? How many more bad whatever? It will all take care of itself, its just production of more junk mail.

RL: What are the alternatives: You spoke earlier of the qualities of inter-disciplinary programs.

JP: Well those are qualities that will have to be addressed anyway. If an art school is going to survive or mutate its going to have to begin to deal with more seriously the characteristics of the contemporary art world (and I'm not going to follow the facetious argument of the avant-garde which I just went through). But more in terms of the production of significant metaphors, which is what art seems to be about in many ways. Its a way of producing a relatable gesture. That also doesn't take into consideration the directed value of any of those gestures. But allegiance towards the manner in which that gesture is made; towards its material contents or it's time structure, are least important in terms of anything other than the maintenance of a fantasy of the practitioners of material contents or gestures. I think an artist is a person who is responsive, is responsible, or has a response-ability, and that a place where those response-abilities are dealt with responsibly

JP: is a place where discourse and accessibility, to ideas and options of production are most accessible. That the place where the impact and origins of those actions are also accessible. Another characteristic of art schools is that frequently the impact and origins of those gestures are not available. You don't have a good sense of art history and much less a good sense of cultural history, or a sense of previous production. A person in an art school does not learn much about the production of an artist in the 19th century or an artist in the 1920's in depth- and does not learn much about why that production took that form at that particular time and who witnessed it and who it was intended for. Those are issues which are not germane to the way art schools seem to function now.

RL: Can this place mutate? For example, could the World Studies Department develop a relevant program that addresses these problems? With their apparent orientation, in fact why haven't they; are they handcuffed? At least on paper there seems to be conflicts with World Studies and lets say the painting department.

JP: One of the problems is that there is a World Studies department separate from a painting department.

RL: Yes, but they share the same students.

JP: Yeah, except that the efficacy of those structures or the production of either situation, or the relationship to the students, or these students response to any of that stuff is never called into question. Some of it is not even taken for granted. It is merely assumed that something is happening.

RL: It goes in one ear and out the other. There's no accountability. Its just gratuitous information.

JP: Yeah. One faculty member doesn't have a sense of what another faculty member is doing. You don't have a sense of the kind of randomness of information a student picks up, the quality of that information. Another real strong characteristic of the perpetuation of the hierarchies' fantasy is that there is no real consistent formal, logical, open, critical evaluation

JP: system of either classes, or instructors, or the function of departments, or even of the administrators. Theres definitely no place in which students are called upon to be responsible to the acquisition of their own education. The evaluations of classes is something which is handled differently. Its never been formally instituted. I think it threatens alot of instructors. Its something students don't want to spend very much time with. Its not clear how those evaluations are used. Whether they are used to hire and fire, whether they're used to advise students on the quality of a particular class, or the content of that class. As far as I know those evaluations have never been published, so that students can tell if the students the semester before felt they got something out of the class. Class evaluations have never been followed through in any consistent program. Some faculty ignore it, some pass them out. Its purposeful in a passive way. In other words it serves the purpose of the conservatory. But, nonetheless, evaluations are made, people are hired and fired, but those evaluations are not formal, they're made by a few people without accountability. Thats one of the traditions of the Art Institute. So that you see factions and hierarchies perpetuating themselves, much to the detriment of the ostensible goals. If you look at most of the departments you'll find that there are people in the department who have been there for a very long time. And you'll find in most of those cases, there is a strong predominance, to put it mildly, of white males, senior white males; its very tribal, very patriarchal. And those particular white males are the least productive, least communicative, least responsible members of those departments. Yet those people are the people who have formulated policy for those departments and consequently for the institution. I don't mean to be ageist, re: the 'senior' white males- its just that this is an old school and alot of incredible people have been through here. Why are we stuck with

P: these particular senior and especially white males. But I think that the Art Institute will mutate and it will mutate into something more responsible or more effective or it will cease.

L: When you say that it will mutate into something more effective, do you mean that it will find a way to successfully continue it's present course? That it may lapse ever more into this 1950's notion of art and society?

P: Yeah, I mean it has a propensity to survive. Any institution does, I'm not saying that this is any different. I'm saying its irresponsible. Because it does not meet, does not evaluate itself, it has no quality of self-criticism; it does not have a collective understanding of what it is dealing with. It moves in a much more random, reactionary way. If enrollment drops then something is done to increase enrollment. For example, the addition of color pictures in the catalog, because there is a correlation between enrollment and color pictures in an art school catalog. Advertising is increased. Recruiting is stepped up. Those steps are taken. The Institute is seen as a commodity thats sold to an audience. Thats what I mean by, 'it will mutate', it will mutate in that way. The problems of that market and the problems of the maintenance of this structure get to be a pinch. So that the audience thats being sought after is a funny audience more and more. Essentially the people who would be most responsible are increasingly squeezed out of the picture in terms of the ostensible goals of the institution. So that a more and more perverse commodity is being advertised.

RL: Who are the people who would be more responsible? And how are they squeezed out?

JP: In terms of dealing with the production of artists it gets more decadent in terms of who it serves. In other words, I would assume in looking at the general population, knowing alot of artists, and knowing a little about the art world, that most artists come

P: from the middle economic level of the population. There seems to be some strong motivational ties to survival, it has to do with self-worth and personal production, the whole Protestant ethic sort of thing. Those are also the people who are in the best position to relate to taking on an ability to change, to learn, to grow, and to reflect. The people who more and more comprise the population of the school and this is because of the tuition pinch, are the people who are rich enough that they can afford to go, or the people who are poor enough that they can get scholarship aid. Thats a real funny population for a school, funny contradictory notions of self-worth, motivations, relations to sub-culture problems like the art-world and very different attitudes towards change and the need of change, and how change is acquired. The art-world is a flux condition, where change is the most important commodity. Its like you're embracing opposing populations, one which has the least resistance to change, the most apathetic attitude towards the for of motivation endowed in the Protestant ethic, and you're mixing that with a group of people who are most frustrated in terms of status quo, the most victemized by it, and the least interested in the fantasies of a privileged culture. And they're being taught by people who see a continuingly changing population passing through to sort of proselytize an antique fantasy upon.

RL: Right. What you end up with is a terribly repressive structure.

JP: Yeah. There are alot of contradictions which are never raised, never dealt with, never seen. And more and more demands for third world tuition waivers, community outreach programs, or ideas which launder, wash off a little bit of the guilt without really addressing the change.

RL: Again, what is the future of this place?

JP: Well, I see that reactionary attitude perpetuates itself until it becomes so obtuse that something real dramatic happens; until it ceases to address any function. As tuition gets higher, as increased factionalism either inter-departmentally or within departments increases, it will become less and less flexible, it just becomes more and more unwieldy. As it becomes more expensive it becomes less attractive to people who support it. No angel is going to fly down out of the sky and endow this institution to where it can afford to go without students. Student are seen as a population, a random population with no force, (not seen as an informed population like they are once they get here). Its like you can advertise anything and get people here- when they get here they'll realiz they want to stay. But what happens when you can advertise anything and people realize they don't want to stay or they don't want to come.

RL: Is that happening now?

JP: Yeah. One thing that is happening is, 'why pay the money it costs to go here when you can get all of that plus some space to work in, some decent equipment to work with, the same kind of in-growr toenail tenure structure with the same kind of water buffalos in the back of, the school sitting in the mud for $50. If you can learn to be an artist at SF State as well as you can learn to be an artist at the SFAI, then more and more people are going to learn how to do it at SF State. The only thing that seems to be holding this place up, keeping it alive, is the vitality (which is also talked about in the same glowing terms as tradition). That vitality is something that is never acknowledged, or dealt with, or confronted. In a way it's a kind of romantic indulgence. In other words you buy the fiction that you're a romantic artist, that you go to a romantic art school. That is a very expensive fiction. It is a real expensive costume. What seems to be the most important real thing here is a discourse, an aggressive discourse on the part of people outside the school coming to the school. I think that the most important thing that a student learns in this school isn't learned from an instructor, its learned from either other students or people that person sees as an artist. The most positive thing this school has going for it is a very aggressive visitors program which gets smaller and smaller all the time. And thats never seen in any kind of orgainized way, its a random thing, but at least its a freshness. Its the only time that the real world leaks into the school. But its smaller and smaller and less and less, who are you stuck with when you can no longer afford visitors?

RL: Given what you have said about the insularity of this place, that leak serves an important purpose. But still, in its randomness, lacks a perspective. And this is all compounded by the rather thin resources of the art-world.

JP: I don't think things are going to change here. Its real hard to change things. I think that it would probably be better to start over. Maybe this will come out by starting over again. I think a school should function with a communicative dialogue; it should function as a collective with not only an aggressive posture towards discourse but an aggressive maintenance of <u>quality</u> discourse. In other words, its self-critical, it also works on the <u>value</u> of that criticism and on the <u>mediation</u> of conflict; those are real classical collective premises. At that point you can begin to deal with at least a closer alignment of ostensible and real objectives. That probably means that it will be a very small school. It would be very hard to work there. It would be a real responsibility. It would mean that any participant in that situation would be called upon 24 hours a day to be a responsible member of that community. An <u>art</u> school may not be the right name, because I find <u>art</u> a little too loaded right now. Loaded in terms of context, loaded in terms of tradition, loaded in terms of expectations. Maybe <u>cultural</u> is a better term to talk about what one would do there, or learn there, or produce there. It also is a broader term which deals with alot of different vocabularies. Its important in this idea of cultural institution to become familiar with the parameters and history of the culture; of it's dynamics and it's growths. In other words, you have to become knowledgeable. The <u>last</u> thing something like that will be, is what's usually bandied about with alot of breast beating, like gorrillas in old movies, a studio school.

RL: Now you are looking at the problems in a much more significant way. Prior to this I felt that you were criticizing the school for only it's stated goals without regarding adequately the value of those goals. In my view, many of those values are extremely dubious and I would prefer to jump ahead and criticize those values achieved or not. Criteria such as professionalism is a questionable value in this sense.

JP: Professionalism is a limited term. It means that you do your job as well as is expected of you. As a professional artist in the strictest sense you've become a professional ego, a professional reactionary, a rofessional producer; in which you validate yourself as a fabricator of commodities. To maintain your professionality you show, you sell, you keep abreast, you buy all those accoutrements of success. All that means that ultimately you've rendered yourself free of historical, political, social responsibility because its unprofessional to step out of line, to disdain museums, collections, sales, magazine articles.

RL: This is my objection to the concept or professionalism. You are obliged to measure your worth according to an externalized set of values.

JP: Thats right. The thing about a studio school is that it trains professionals. It trains professional illiterates. It maintains that level of illiteracy. Its like Detroit, building models with built-in obsolesence, functioning on a half-life that is constantly deteriorating. Eventually there will be a time when not enough people will want to buy that expensive romantic fiction, from the fictional characters that staff it. I think an ideal situation, is a situation that has a responsibility to a goal, not to itself. To address a situation and when that situation no longer exists, that entity will change or dissolve.

RL: If this place were genuinely functioning with real goals it would be in a sense working towards it's own end. That is one vision of art's role in the society, where art is working to free us of sublimations, repressions, and constraints. And in an ideal and free society there wouldn't be the numbers of artists; art wouldn't have the same function and perhaps importance.

JP: An artist wouldn't go to that school to learn to be a painter, because what does it mean to be a painter? What an artist would learn there would be a fluency, a literacy, a way to efficiently mediate, metaphorize, address in the most effective forms. And if that means mud pies, or painting, or molotov cocktails, it doesn't matter.

RL: Realizing all this, how do you function here?

JP: At this point I have several options that are all fairly cynical in terms of survival, in terms of the given situation, and the world order. One is to deal with people individually as I encounter them in a way that I feel is gratifying and stimulating. Another is to maintain an income and survive until situations improve or to withdraw completely and deal with another situation, another place, another time, another attitude with another group of people. I don't feel real optimistic about the likiihood of developing an ideal situation. I'm more concerned with learning myself. I think one of the biggest myths about an art school is that once you graduate you no longer have a responsibility to yourself or anyone else as a student. I'm very eager to learn, to grow, to change. I have an ambivalence about what that is and where that is. I would enjoy functioning in a context I described. I think that an ideal situation would not resemble a school in terms of validations and terminations. You would participate in that situation as long as it was productive. It might be very hard to tell the difference between the students and the faculty.



"How do you like my ocean?" by Ken Mann

Pete (the guy sitting on the floor in this picture) and I worked as cooks together in a restaurant in Sausalito in '76 and '77. We also share some of the same conflicting influences. Pete and Carl and Lani have shared this work with me as it has evolved and they are it's most important audience. This is most useful to them. I told Pete that I wanted to share his situation with other people who might, ideally, with his help, be able to change some of these conflicts. "None of this is my choice. This is something that I have no control over. If I could move out tomorrow and start all over again I would do it, but I can't. I'm working twenty hours a week. I'm barely getting by. That's why I ain't got no fucking pot is because I ain't got no money to buy any. But I will still buy fish for my tank. I can sit here in front of this tank at night by myself and I can figure out the secrets of the universe just by checking out the fish. I mean it could be better. I could have a nice two bedroom house with a big old front yard and some trees and shit."

---one from a series of five

Every learning experience is positive. As for the motivations to work, it has depended on the classes I've taken. Right now, two months before graduation, I feel I've reacted against all the negative aspects I've seen personified in other people, trying to fight them in my own work, which is also positive, after all.....

This school negative. I feel alienated here. At my J.C. I felt at home, part of a family. Here, no feelings from the people, no feelings put into "art" or "constructive criticism".

Very positive and very negative. SFAI collects very interesting folks.. that's food, art school tends to define ART & reinforce acceptable art behavior.. that's bad. The Good, The Bad, and even da Ugly. I hate it but I'll make it- can't wait to leave.

5. Do you feel students conform to standards set by school and the "art world" to be accepted? If so, how wide spread?

New and impressionable students might conform to attitudes prevalent here, copying contemporary art without attaining an appreciation of it through natural development and hard work.

Yes, although it is my intention to do my own work and enhance my own vision, I recognize the existance of the art world-society-system. I think most people, including myself, want acceptance recognition in their field and we can learn about the "ways of that world" here. Sometimes that acceptance is gained by conformity to a system, some people conform to the system because they don't know that there is anything else to do. Therefor, I think conformity is widespread for various reasons.

It varies. Some students are here to learn their craft, widen their outlooks become more informed in all art areas, even those outside their major. They generally are not intimidated into conforming to the latest "fad". (I feel I fit into the above) Then there are students who are buying time so they can decide what they want to do. Others conform to be accepted. They quickly find out what's the going "thing", the politics of the art world-sure, they are the ones who get to exhibit too. But I can't do that...yet. Maybe someday I'll have to. I hope not.

I see the necessity of questioning these standards in many people, but there is also a lack of information and a final resignation that leads people to accept these standards as something"unavoidable". Example of that is the long line of people waiting to show their portfolios to the editor of Popular Photography last month, even if they knew that the criteria of the magazine is not exactly like our criteria. Another example of conformity was the show of punk art in the Diego Rivera Gallery last January, it was just another show, with an opening like all the others, cheese, crackers, white wine.. Aren't punks against conventions?

Here definitely. Look at the "punk" show. Just how "established" is this? All too many are too passive to make their own statements. Too few instructors here encourage unique individuality.

Yes..Yes..YES!..almost universally. We are social creatures and conformity is a kind of vocabulary or conversation one uses to become a participant. Baa Baa Black Sheep.

6. Do you feel competativemess in this school or others you have attended? If so, is it a positive or negative factor?

No.
Yes. It can be a positive factor if it is done in a friendly spirit of mutual care and striving to improve oneself.

A bit, and it's negative. I feel the photography department to be more competative than say--ceramics. Printmaking falls in between those two. It's a completely different set up working in a large room, talking to people while you work, helping each other out etc. as in Ceramics. Photographer's lock themselves up in a tiny room-a few hours later they come out with hese masterpieces (or duds, whatever) to present to the class, friends etc.
There are not that many competitions in this school (formal contests, I mean) There were many more in my country. But also the way people work here, in a closed individualistic approach, talks about competativeness. There is competativeness around us all over in this society(and I'm including mine). I think the only way to fight it is realizing the things we have in common & work in a complimentary way-

I feel it and here it is negative."if you can not match up to whats happening do not even bother".

Yes-Yes-YEH-it's degeneration of one's social use.

7. Do you feel art school intellectualized art to a negative degree?

Yes, I was disappointed to find this school inhabited by an elite, self-perpetuated conformity to an aesthetic that can survive only within the school's walls. I was under the impression that there would be artists, rather than a priviliedged few, like myself, indulging in an enjoyable pastime which is untenable in the real world.

Yes, sometimes. But, if I encountered such stuff I either glommed (paid close attention to) on to that which wasn't mystified by intellectualization or spent some time to try to decode the mystery and thereby learned something. The intellectual mystery of art as it is sometimes presented is not always worth decoding. Sometimes it is better to recognize that art has a magic quality beyond word description. It can have a presence.

I think this is an excellent question. The fact that you have asked it means someone else besides myself has noticed that? This school intellectualizes art to a negative degree!!! I didn't notice the phenomenon so much in my first two years at another school; but here it hits you like a ton of bricks. There are some students who thrive on this aspect of art. I think they are doomed to become art critics. I'd rather do than talk about it. But no discussion at all is not good either.

If intellectualizing something means analyzing and understanding, it can't be negative. Not understanding something produces fear, and fear makes people susceptible to conditioning and domination by others.

Here, with so many grad. students you have to rhetorically prove your worth.

NO-NO-NO--FUCKED QUESTION

8. What plans do you have after school for your work (if any?)?

10 A return to home movies and snapshots. Maybe an uncreative involvement in media or film.

Pursuing the usual established routes available as my personality permits. I am open to alternatives including any media with audience (newspapers, magazines, etc.)

I have one more semester till I graduate and am already looking for possibilities to be able to combine my photography with work. The picture at present looks bleak--I want to stay in S.F. after I graduate but photorelated jobs seem to be in New York(area) I do not plan grad school. I have no desire at present to teach least of al anyone under 22 years.

Work and try to be as authentic as possible, and talk to other people, teach and learn.

Keep it private and scrub pots.

Do it.....silly

These are a small cross-section of the results of a survey put out March-April 1979. The complete survey and answers will be in the SFAI library in a notebook documenting Reagen Louie's Review of Contempary Photography class. Ask at reserve desk.

TERRY DOVALE -"PHOTOGRAPHS BY ME"

As seen in the Hallway Gallery 'Photographs by me" is an autobiographical representation of the artist's current and recent working images. All untitled these photographs are a working collection of ideas in development.

The strength of the show lies in the imagery concerned with light and movement as atmospherical - experiential elements/ These photographs evoke a subtle sensuality as felt in remembering images from dreams and the vague certainty of subconcious traces. These images are slightly unfocussed and strongly felt. The frames contain, cavernous places/a field of light in a tunnel hallway/light moving through and on top of transparencies/fabrications of texture, shadow/people, fuzzy and nominal in an overall action, force of light.

The direction of her work is a refreshing departure from the realism of the gray-scale.

Kathryn Golden



The gardeners work every day for about four hours. The man standing in front is Art, he was born a year before the big earthquake. Before retiring he was a carpenter. He told me San Francisco used to be a "real good union town" and that there used to be five daily newspapers before "Hearst bought them." Walker (in back) does not like to be photographed. He used to own a construction firm similar to many that Art worked for. In the garden they almost always work together.
The condominiums sit up on Red Rock Hill like fortresses. The gardeners told me that Red Rock Hill was twenty times higher before the excavation for the condominiums. They all shrug their shoulders and say "that's progress."

---Bruce A. Freeman

AWARENESS GUIDE TO MIRRORS AND WINDOWS
(AND IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY)

TO THE VISITOR WHO WILL VIEW THE PHILIP MORRIS CO. SPONSORED WINDOWS AND MIRRORS SHOW: I am concerned about the growing dehumanization of photography and I wish to share my thoughts with each visitor to the SFMMA...

WHY WAS IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY CANCELLED?

Since I've left the corporate world (read text of Interior America, Aperture, 1978) and devoted my full time to photography and the alienation problem, I've been discouraged to find that management of art photography is growing to resemble technical bureaucracies much like you'd find at Standard Oil in Richmond, or at Kaiser Industries in Oakland in the East Bay near San Francisco where I live. Like their corporate manager counterparts with whom I'm familiar, art managers are bent on silencing even a "peep" that might embarrass a source of income or threaten expansion.

The San Francisco Museum of Modern Art is featuring the Philip Morris Co. and Museum of Modern Art's MIRRORS AND WINDOWS exhibition that contains a photo of mine I've been trying to have removed from the show. And just recently, SFMMA cancelled IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY, an exhibition that contains photographs of mine I'd like to have seen. Why one show is featured and the other cancelled can best be traced to the expansion plans of Eugene Trefethen, Kaiser's retired president and Henry Hopkins, SFMMA's director. (Read, SFMMA Expire Building, Los Angeles Times, 3-11-79).

A pattern is beginning to emerge. Museum trustees and their trusted administrators, high art publishers such as Aperture, and even National Endowment staff are becoming too sensitive to the possibility of losing money from corporate patrons and are not allowing photographs that engage social issues. Photographic art, by recent definition, can not address social issues or it is not "art"(letter to me from Aperture's president and vice-chairman of MOMA's photo committee, Arthur Bullowa, 12-11-78). This explains, for example, why MOMA never exhibited Gene Smith's MINIMATA, the photo study of mercury poisoning caused by corporate indifference in Japan. (A letter to me, 8-25-78, from Ms. Judith Price, New York patron who hosted the summer swim party for MIRRORS AND WINDOWS photographers, says that she is now engaged in soliciting funds from Japanese corporations on behalf of MOMA's "Development Committee".)

So protective have curators become that they are giving off none too subtle hints. And photographers are picking up the cues and are allowing themselves to be corraled into denying the content of their own pictures. They do this by refusing to take responsibility for subject matter and so assure themselves of a place in the struggle for recognition. The denial of picture content in favor of intellectualized "form" is now widely practiced as a way to neutralize material embarrassing to corporate patrons. Emasculated photographs satisfying the criteria of "formalism" are the products of the new academy. And that's ninety-nine percent of Philip Morris' MIRRORS AND WINDOWS.

Formalist photographers have become depersonalized and they seem to know it, but don't care — as long as they are "making it". Gary Winogrand, at the pinnacle of the heirarchy of art photographers assured a young audience at the San Francisco Art Institute, "You may not want to invite me to dinner at your home," he said. "But that doesn't matter. I'm only interested in making good photographs — the kind that haven't been made before." Gary reminds me of engineers I know in the corporate world who make deadly chemicals without a qualm as they ascend the management ladder.

When I met John Szarkowski, MOMA's photo chief, for the first time in the summer of 1977 at the time of my exhibition at MOMA, he warned me not to "moralize" or "theorize" and singled out "hard" photographs for praise. He successfully "formalized" my photographs in the exhibition on technology by ironical gameplaying so that meaning was totally lost. Later, when I refused to sell photographs to MOMA and demanded return of four I'd sold ten years before, he refused to respond. And still he remains silent when asked to return a phone call or answer a letter. In the MIRRORS AND WINDOWS catalog, page 125, you see one of the four pictures, Escalon Hotel Before Demolishment: an example of how a protest photograph is formally transformed into a Christmas card.

****

Photographs to be art must be beautiful. That's art management's new myth that glosses photo content. Implied in the myth is discomfort with change — especially social change. The IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY exhibition scheduled for the Fall of 1979 was cancelled a full year ahead by SFMMA when I, as one of the four originators of the show who had secured NEA survey grant money to do it, was accused of being "disorganized".

What happened was SFMMA began to see clearly that I intended more than just beautiful pictures. They didn't believe it at first. I told the Museum I'd have to participate in editing the book that was supposed to accompany the show because I feared cooptation or emasculation of message. And they cancelled the exhibition shortly after they found out I'd prepared a slide show on Orville England, a Standard Oil stage-rigger injured without compensation.[1] Several major Bay Area museum directors and curators have privately agreed Trefethen's embarrassment by the Standard Oil slide show was the reason for the cancellation of IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY. Hopkins is not as concerned about embarrassment of Standard Oil's Board Chairman Harold Haynes-simply because Standard doesn't give much money to the SFMMA anyway.

Upon applying to the NEA for additional funding of IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY, we were refused. A photo survey panel member privately told me, "The NEA staff shelved your IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY project and called it 'anti-establishment'. It didn't even come before the panel for review for refunding in 1978." The reason for the oversight, given to me by the NEA staff, was, "the application was not legible or coherent". They did not advise me of the problem until after the panel had met, however.

And Aperture's editor, Michael Hoffman, has much too cautiously refused to publish any of the Standard Oil photographs from the IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY exhibition even though these photographs are openly referred to in the text of Interior America. I fought five years to keep it from happening, but the pretentious and glossy high art treatment of Interior America nearly destroys the book's message of rage. Hoffman, who has internalized a fear of the privileged controllers of Aperture, Shirley Burden and Arthur Bullowa, told me on his last visit, "I don't know how to handle" the Standard Oil photographs.

So we have a pretty clear message. The official art system can't tolerate artists who are dealing with the rapid social evolution that's occurring in America. I think curators are too cautious. Corporations are not threatened by the likes of me. A letter from Philip Morris' Frank Saunders, 1-12-79, indicates concern over radicalization of artists by too cautious treatment and repression of necessary messages. But it's for sure: museums are no place for artists who are questioning social roles; they are for upwardly mobile gamespeople. I have no choice but to be an anti-official art artist.

— Chauncey Hare

1. The slide show transcript can be obtained by sending $1.50 to Box 162 Point Richmond, California, 94807. Ask for THE CASE FOR ORVILLE ENGLAND.

this page reserved for your own creativity, advertisement & frustrations

NEIGHBOURS

These questions were presented individually to the residents immediatly surrounding the Art Institute on Monday april 8th, by Connie Hatch and R. Scott Dewell:

The proximity of the San Francisco Art Institute to a well-established residential community affords some consideration. As students at the institute we are concerned with the relationship between the artists learning environment and the community which surrounds it.

To initiate a bridge of communication with the community, we asked questions about the awareness of the institute to

be followed by a questionnaire given to the students on their wareness of the community. We would appreciate their help in answering these questions as sincerely and candidly as you believe they deserve.

Have you visited any exhibitions, guest lectures, films or performances at either of the Art Institute's galleries? If so, would you like to comment on what you saw there?

YES-5 NO-8
"A film exhibition (referring to Barbara Jo Revell's piece). Thought it sorely lacking in artistic quality. It mystified me. Happened to see it while walking through the gallery."
"The reason I have not attended any art exhibit is because I can't help being antagonized but the attitude of some of the students who should be in love with nature and also not pollute it."
"Yes- I found it an interesting place."

If not, were you aware that these exhibitions and activities are open to the public?
YES-6, NO-7

Are you interested in viewing any art there?
YES-7, NO-3, Maybe-3, occasionally, possibly.

Are you interested in art at all?
YES-10, 1-ocasionally, 1-only representational, 1-maybe.

Do you feel art could hold a more significant role in the community?
YES-11, NO-1, 1-no comment.
"That place isn't civic-minded though"
"Maybe something to do after work.(do they have parties?)"
"Can be very elitest"
"Wish the Art Institute could do some murals on the bulkhead on Leavenworth street-midway from Francisco towards Chestnut- would be a marvelous project and would certainly enhance the attraction of Russian Hill."

Do you feel art could hold a more significant role in your personal life?
YES-10, NO-2, 1-no comment.
"Too old"
"Music, maybe opera."
"I surround myself and fill my house with art, being born and raised in Paris, France. I have always been lucky enough to be in a city with beautiful art to look at."
"I like movies that make me think. I dunno. Painting, that stuff, too intellectual, I'm not stupid, but it makes me feel dumb."

Do you have any reservations about living close to this community of artists?
(In reference to Doug Hollis' wind sculpture) "Wind thing hurts dogs ears."
"More concern for animals left in cars and howling. I called and offered to save trees, no one interested. Destroyed by photochemicals. Sad."
"Consider it an honor and a privilige (living close to artists)."
"No. Just don't park in my driveway."
"No, with one exception' the wind sculpture was very disturbing, both day and night."
"No, but the punk rock crowd seemed like trash and out of place at the institute. The wind sound piece was an 24 hour outrage."
"No, except for the area A stickers on cars obviously not belonging to residents as the institute is not a residential school."
"Unforntunately, yes- some of the students at the institute are both noisy and litter polluters. Have spoken to them about dropping lunch debris, bottles and cans near my trees in front of my house..."
"Generally, I feel that the students are well-mannered, polite and pleasant. I especially appreciate seeing them coming and going in the late evening when I my dog."

Does the Art Institute have anything to offer you?
"Yes, If they went to work, they'd give us more parking/"
"The Art there is made for someone who doesn't have to live with it."
"Something, surely."
"It could."
"I would be interested in some classes, if they are at night."
"Interested in taking dream class."

Does art have anything to offer you?

"Overall I fell the art created at the institute is for the artists and not the general public. I have trouble understanding the art I have seen. Much of it is very sad, and I feel, pointless.

Conclusion to "Neighbours Survey"

These ambivilent and often critical responses to our activities here may be seen as a metaphor for the larger dilemma we face as artists. They raise questions of the myth of the artist and the mystique of art, while addressing experiential issues closer to home. The desire to break out of the tightly structured esoteric art arena and engage an audience in a meaningful, shared dialogue, stands as the precipitant aim of this encounter with our immediate community. We invite your response.

Connie Hatch
R. Scott Dewell

WANT AD

We are very interested in response from students and faculty at SFAI and other institutions;also members of the community whether affiliated with an art school or not.As the purpose of our efforts is to set up a dialogue we are defeated without your response.Please send replies to:

EYE Office
c/o San Francisco Art Institute
800 Chestnut St.
San Francisco,Ca.
94133

NEED A PICK UP TRUCK TO DO SOME HAULING ON 4/26 & 27. THERE'S $7. AN HR. FOR ANYONE WITH A STRONG BACK
CALL LARRY AT 673-8975 or
POST RESPONSE ON ENTRANCE MESSAGE BOARD.